

along with an updated letter, to Secretary Babbitt.⁸² The letter was sent on Dec. 1, barely seven weeks after submission of the Hudson application. The letter asserted, *inter alia*, that Section 20(b)(1) of IGRA requires consultation by the Secretary with surrounding tribes, and that “[t]o date, none of the Tribes currently operating gaming facilities in the area have been consulted.” It also pointed out that MIGA “has gone on record opposing off reservation gaming activity in Minnesota.”

2) MIGA and Its Members Contact the BIA in Washington

MIGA sent another letter dated Jan. 10, 1994, to Secretary Babbitt acknowledging the BIA Area Director’s letter soliciting comment, and reiterating the arguments made in the December 1993 MIGA letter to the Secretary opposing the casino. The Jan. 10 letter explained the two reasons for MIGA’s opposition: first, because the Minnesota tribes, as part of their tribal-state compacts, had “promised not to expand tribal gaming off-reservation”; and second, because the Four Feathers proposal would have a “potential economic impact on Minnesota tribes.” MIGA urged that the proposal would harm Minnesota tribes with casinos close to the Twin Cities, as well as tribes with casinos in more remote areas, because both groups draw their customers from the Twin Cities. MIGA claimed, though, that it was more worried about the Hudson casino’s political implications in Minnesota than its potential as a market competitor, noting that its members had fought hard in recent years to defeat proposals within the state of Minnesota to expand gaming to non-Indian interests, “assuring lawmakers that we view tribal

⁸²In fact, MIGA never passed a new resolution. This may explain, in part, why the Minnesota tribes kept insisting that the BIA had offered “no consultation” – because such an allegation appeared in the 1992 resolution. While this was true in 1992, it was not true in 1994.